THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
OF THE FACULTY SENATE HELD ON
NOVEMBER 9, 2012 IN THE STATE ROOM

Present: Provost Lerman, Registrar Amundson and Parliamentarian Charnovitz;
             Deans Dolling, Feuer, Goldman, and Guthrie; Professors Acquaviva, Barnhill,
             Brazinsky, Briscoe, Castleberry, Dickinson, Fairfax, Garris, Hamano,
             Harrington, Helgert, Kim, McAleavey, Newcomer, Parsons, Sidawy, Stott,
             Swaine, Williams, and Yezer

Absent: President Knapp, Interim Dean Akman, Deans Barratt, Berman, Brown,
             Eskandarian, and Johnson; Professors Cordes, Dhuga, Dickson, Greenberg,
             Lantz, Rehman, Shesser, and Simon

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:18 p.m.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting held on October 12, 2012 were approved as
distributed.

"A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE *FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO DEAN SEARCHES" (12/4)

Provost Lerman called upon Professor Castleberry, Chair of the Senate Executive
Committee. Professor Castleberry said that several editing changes were made by the
Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom to Resolution 12/4 as circulated
with the agenda, and he sought the unanimous consent of the Senate to introduce a
substitute Resolution 12/4 incorporating these changes. He also noted that the substitute
Resolution was circulated to the Senate electronically several days before the meeting.

Professor Parsons objected, asking why the substitute could not be considered at a
future meeting when the Senate had had more time to review it. Professor Garris, Chair of
the PEAF Committee, responded to this concern by saying there was no tremendous need
for urgency, and he thought consideration of the substitute Resolution could be deferred to
a future meeting. He also characterized the changes made by the Committee as minor and
offered to explain each of them to the Senate during debate. Professors McAleavey and
Castleberry both confirmed that the changes made to Resolution 12/4 did not amount to
substantive changes.

Discussion followed on the parliamentary strategies that could be followed, one
being to introduce the Resolution as circulated with the meeting agenda and amending it as
necessary to reflect new language in the substitute Resolution, and the other to consider the

substitute Resolution or postpone consideration of any Resolution on the subject to a future Senate meeting. Following this exchange, Professor Castleberry withdrew the request for unanimous consent for the introduction of the substitute Resolution. Resolution 12/4 as circulated with the meeting agenda was introduced and discussion followed.

Professor Garris outlined the background of Resolution 12/4, saying that, pursuant to provisions of the *Faculty Code*, the tenured faculty in each School have an important role to play in the process of Dean Searches. Prior to 1990 Dean Searches were generally conducted by a faculty Dean Search Committee (DSC). In 1990 there were various groups, mostly student groups, that came forward and asked to be involved in the Dean Search process. The Senate's Committee on Administrative Matters As They Affect the Faculty considered this and decided it was a very good idea, and the Committee formulated Resolution 90/9, [appended to Resolution 12/4 as Exhibit A] which provided for participation in Dean Searches by various constituencies of the University community. However, Resolution 90/9 did not relinquish the central role of the tenured faculty in conducting the searches – it specifically recommended that Search Committee could be enlarged to include students, alumni, Trustees and others, and that these people would play a supporting role in the DSC which, according to the *Faculty Code* is selected from among tenured faculty of a school.

Following adoption of Resolution 90/9 by the Senate and its acceptance by the University administration, Professor Garris related that he was chosen to chair the first DSC that would follow the new procedures. A member of the Board of Trustees, an administrative representative, two students, and an alumni representative participated in an advisory capacity during the search for a new Dean for the School of Engineering and Applied Science. The search utilizing the new procedure was widely regarded as a success and this procedure has been used for over twenty years at GW, most recently in the searches for Deans of the School of Public Health and Health Services and the Law School.

Professor Garris characterized the amendments to the *Faculty* Code proposed in Resolution 12/4 primarily as a matter of housekeeping, as the provisions of Resolution 90/9 were never formally incorporated into the *Code*. The purpose of Resolution 12/4 is to clarify the respective roles of the Faculty DSC which consists of elected, tenured faculty members of the School, and the enlarged Dean Search Committee. In a number of Dean Searches, uncertainty about these roles has arisen, for example, in determining whether the DSC could go into Executive Session for discussions without including non-voting members of the enlarged Search Committee. In addition to putting forward an amendment to the *Faculty Code*, the PEAF Committee developed a template (attached to Resolution 12/4 as Exhibit B) provide further guidance for conducting Dean Searches. The Committee did not intend that the template be adopted for every school, but rather put it forward as a model that employs principles that have worked in other schools and can serve as a starting point for others.

Discussion followed. Professor Newcomer said she was totally supportive of the Resolution, but moved to table the vote on it so that the Columbian College (CCAS) Dean Search Committee could have an opportunity to review it further. Provost Lerman clarified that provisions of Resolution 12/4 would not apply to the Dean Search currently underway in CCAS.

The motion to table was seconded, and a vote was taken. The motion failed by a vote of 7 in favor and 12 opposed (none abstaining). Discussion continued.

Professor Barnhill spoke in support of Resolution 12/4, saying he agreed with Professor Garris that it confirms the central role of tenured faculty and clarifies the roles of other non-voting search committee members.

Professor Parsons spoke against the adoption of Resolution 12/4, saying that the *Faculty Code* is already very clear about how Dean Searches are to be conducted. The problem has been that people have not read the *Code* carefully and they have not followed it. He added that he thought that adding an elaboration to the *Code* would be futile, and could be more confusing than helpful.

Professor Swaine said he voted against the motion to table because he thought it would be helpful for the Senate to conduct some substantive discussion before deciding if Resolution 12/4 should be returned to PEAF for further work. One question was whether the Dean Search Committee should be the group that decides about the non-voting membership of the enlarged Search Committee as opposed to the "faculty of the whole" of a School. With respect to Exhibit B, the template, Professor Swaine said he thought it could be strengthened on a somewhat more generic and less prescriptive basis. If not, then it might be appropriate for the Senate not to endorse the entire extensive procedure set forth in the template.

Professor Yezer agreed in general with Professor Swaine's observations. He added that he thought that discussions should be included in activities the DSC could discuss in Executive Session, and that perhaps the template should clarify that the DSC could at any time, declare an Executive Session in conformity with Robert's Rules of Order. Professor Yezer also said he agreed with Professor Parsons that the language of the *Faculty Code* is clear on the subject of Dean Searches; he also agreed with Professor Swaine that it would be a good idea to consider deleting Senate endorsement of the template from Resolution 12/4. Professors Acquaviva and Helgert spoke about the importance of ensuring confidentiality in Dean Searches, and Professor Castleberry advised that he was prepared to offer a motion to recommit Resolution 12/4 to Committee for consideration of changes under discussion.

Dean of the School of Public Health and Health Services Lynn Goldman indicated that the two elected Senate representatives from SPHHS were unable to attend the meeting due to outside professional commitments, and that she wished to convey their comments, and her own to the Senate. Dean Goldman said that she agreed in spirit with Resolution 90/9's adoption of expanded Dean Search Committees. However, she said she thought by now it is probably outmoded and it would be appropriate for the PEAF Committee to look at procedures GW's peer institutions are utilizing to insure that an appropriate process for the future is adopted.

Dean Goldman then read an excerpt for Senator Lantz's e-mail concerning Resolution 12/4. Professor Lantz conveyed her regret that she could not be at the Senate meeting and said that she wanted to go on record as opposing adoption of the Resolution. Professor Lantz then expressed her primary objection, that allowing only tenured faculty

members to serve as voting members of the Dean Search Committee is far too restrictive. Based on her own experience, Professor Lantz said that non-tenured, junior, and tenure-track faculty members provide great insight and are the future of any School and they need to be represented on Dean Search Committees as voting members. It is also common to include senior faculty from other schools, and to include non-tenure track faculty and research faculty [at GW, research staff with professorial titles] in the search process.

Dean Goldman then read from Senator Greenberg's e-mail, which said he supported the principle that Dean Searches should be as inclusive as possible and include the voices of research, non-tenure-track, and junior faculty. Further, based on his understanding that all GW schools are different, there needs to be flexibility in the composition of Dean Search Committees. Professor Greenberg also recommended a clause stating that individual schools can modify Dean Search procedures and include the voting voices of other faculty classes as well as students, alumni, Trustees, and staff, as well as a clause that allows schools to include nonvoting representatives on Search Committees.

Dean Goldman concluded by saying that she thought the issue of Search Committee composition and roles should be reconsidered after surveying peer institutions to find out more about their Dean Search practices. What is important is to arrive at a process that incorporates best practices and can be carried out swiftly, respectfully, and fairly, to stakeholders and candidates, with the result that the best possible leaders are recruited to move GW forward into the next century. The University should be managing for results and should do so in a way that honors the input of all faculty, staff, researchers, students, alumni, and other stakeholders.

The privilege of the floor was extended to Professor Mark Reeves, Chair of the Search Committee in CCAS that is the process of searching for a new Dean. He related that he has been in touch with members of that Search Committee and that it seemed to them and to him that, although the template is a set of recommendations, it is quite intimidating in its detail. He added that he thought the template contains many good ideas, but would rather see these as a suggestion that schools approach this from the point of view of placing such a template in their own bylaws so that the procedure could be integrated with their own practice and culture. Professor Garris responded that the PEAF Committee's intention was that the template would provide a starting point for schools organizing Dean Searches, and that it was not intended that every detail be a requirement.

Professor Reeves said he thought that the response to Resolution 12/4, both from the CCAS Dean Search Committee and from the Senate, indicated that in spite of all good intentions, people have not viewed the template as a recommendation, and therein lies the problem. It might be useful for the template to exist as a backup, but not a set of regulations that must be followed.

Further discussion followed. Professor Williams added his voice to those who expressed the view that Dean Search Committees include contract, junior, and research faculty as he agreed these stakeholders are an important part of the University's future. Professor Briscoe said he agreed with the need to avoid being overly prescriptive in suggesting how Dean Searches might be organized. Professor Garris responded by saying he thought that Resolution 12/4 addresses the issue of including, at the discretion of the

Faculty Dean Search Committee, non-voting members. Professor Kim spoke in favor of revising the template in the form of a clear and concise document that leaves room for the imagination and ambiguity. She also said that if practices at peer institutions are surveyed, particular attention should be paid to search procedures at private as well as state educational institutions as these can differ significantly due to requirements of state law.

Professor Castleberry moved to recommit Resolution 12/4 to Committee to consider the discussion held at the meeting and bring back a revised proposal at a future Senate meeting. The motion was seconded. Professor Garris spoke in favor of the motion to recommit and expressed appreciation for the feedback provided, saying he thought it would be very useful information for the Committee to review. The question was called, a vote was taken, and the motion was adopted by unanimous vote. (Resolution 12/4 and accompanying exhibits A and B were distributed with the agenda for the meeting.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

No resolutions were introduced.

REPORT ON THE READING LEADERS PILOT PROGRAM

Professor Newcomer, Chair of the University and Urban Affairs Committee, presented the Report. She related that she had chaired the Committee, which includes a number of faculty members as well as administrators throughout the University, since June of 2011.

During the 2011-12 year the members of the Committee focused on what they might accomplish, and all agreed to try and do one thing and to do it well. The task selected was a faculty-led community service project. During the year, the Committee went through a variety of vetting activities to make sure the project selected would be both appropriate and well-focused.

Professor Newcomer said she approached the D.C. government SERVE D.C. liaison, and the Committee ended up working on adult literacy in partnership with the Washington Literacy Center. Plans were made to initiate the activity during Adult Literacy Week beginning the week of September 4th. Professor Newcomer said she then recruited faculty and graduate students. In the end more faculty volunteered than could be used due to the room capacity at the Washington Literacy Center where the sessions were held. That location was chosen because it was far easier for the adults who utilize the services to come there as opposed to finding their way to Foggy Bottom.

Six teams were formed, which included six faculty members in addition to Associate Provost Donna Scarboro. Six students, five of whom were from the Trachtenberg School and the other from the Psy.D. program, also participated. Between Sept. 4 and Sept. 20th, the team visited the Center to conduct 18 adult literacy sessions, and the effort was extremely successful as measured by a survey of everyone who participated as well as staff at the Washington Literacy Center. In sum, Professor Newcomer said that the Center is extremely grateful and asked her to express to anyone she could how delighted they were with the initiative.

REPORT OF THE PHYSICAL FACILITIES COMMITTEE

Professor Helgert, Chair of the Physical Facilities Committee, presented the Report, which is included with these minutes. The Committee was asked to provide an update on the status of Physical Facilities at the University and in order to do this, the Committee met with various individuals to try to get a current view of what is going on. The Committee focused on four items: the status of University classrooms, the status of and Plans for Audio-Visual and Information Technologies, the status of University construction and renovation projects, and plans over the near term for additional future University construction projects. The Report lists the names of this year's Committee members. Professor Helgert also especially acknowledged the tremendous help from and willingness to provide information by these individuals: Alicia O'Neil Knight, Senior Associate Vice President of Operations; Craig Linebaugh, Senior Associate Provost for Academic Operations; and P.B. Garrett, Associate Provost and Chief Academic Technology Officer.

The Report details the current status of classroom availability on GW's three campuses, the total of general purpose classrooms and laboratories currently being 135; these serve more than 3000 courses. Eight additional special rooms offer access to video conferencing capabilities or computing facilities, some of these used for language labs and special purposes. A total of 25 general purpose classrooms accommodating between 12 and 20 students is available. And that is a critical issue, because this is the normal class size and it turns out that each of these classrooms serves 70 courses during the regular semester. There is a critical need for additional smaller classrooms holding up to 20 students.

According to the Report, two things are important in terms of improving classroom availability: becoming more efficient in terms of how the classrooms are used, and the need to move out of leased classroom space on K Street and 1776 G Street due to cost issues. In the Science and Engineering Hall presently under construction the classroom space problem will become more acute since the number of teaching labs going into the SEH has been reduced to accommodate more research facilities. This exaggerates the problem of classroom availability, which in turn reduces the amount of available backfill space in buildings from which science and engineering facilities will be relocated.

One possibility might be retaining some of Tompkins Hall for use by the School of Engineering and Applied Science. It is also possible that when Engineering moves out of the 6th and 7th Floor of Phillips Hall those two floors would be converted to classroom space. These spaces might well fill the need for classes of 20 students or less. A study could be conducted to include this and other possibilities, including the use of Corcoran Hall, to see how much of this backfill space can be converted to classroom space.

The University is currently in an information-gathering mode in an effort to find ways of improving classroom scheduling efficiency. Apparently there is some new software that will be brought online shortly that would allow the time period between successive uses of a classroom to be shortened somewhere to the neighborhood of 15 minutes, thus yielding more uses of classrooms in a given day.

The Report gives a detailed summary on pages 9 through 17 concerning the current status of classroom audiovisual and information technology, including the work of the

Academic Technologies staff to maintain equipment and deploy improved technology in these areas. This is a challenge, as much of the available equipment is hopelessly outdated. Currently 84 classrooms and laboratories are equipped with mostly outdated analog AV and IT infrastructure. Most of the low-technology classrooms are equipped with an overhead projector, nothing more. There is very little or no internet connectivity in the majority of classrooms.

In terms of enhanced classroom capabilities, the Report presents information on the 31 Colonial Cast classrooms on the Foggy Bottom campus and three SCALE-UP (Student-Centered Active Learning Environments for Undergraduate Programs) classrooms in Monroe B33, Monroe 111 and Tompkins 201 that include modern AV and IT equipment designed to encourage and facilitate collaboration between students. All technology-enhanced classrooms include Course Response Systems where a student can provide feedback to the instructor directly in real time; that information is collected and in some classrooms this technology is permanently installed. Portable systems for use in other classrooms can also be obtained/ checked out on a need basis from Academic Technologies.

As described on pages 12 through 14 of the Report, the University has developed a three-to-four year schedule to eventually dispose of everything now in these analog-equipped classrooms and equip them with modern 100% digital information technology. A new strategic plan is under development, focusing on the deployment of a standardized AV and IT infrastructure across GW's three campuses. This will include as a first step removing all analog televisions, overhead and video projectors, as well as other peripherals such as DVD players and personal computers. Depending on capacity, classrooms will then be reconfigured to include a number of new components, to include whiteboards or whiteboard painted walls, high definition LCD displays and projectors, digital ceiling-mounted cameras, resident workstations, and lecture recording capability and speech reinforcement via wireless or podium microphones. Connectivity will also be provided by digital AV signal routing using HDMI specifications along with digital interface and wireless network access for faculty laptops, tablets or smart phones. Wired networking capability for workstations and AV systems as well as Voice over IP connectivity between classrooms and Academic Technologies service teams will be provided, along with managed network switches for remote monitoring. Course response systems, such as Turning point, will be installed.

Academic Technologies (AT) has launched a number of projects, including the configuration of four pilot classrooms in Phillips Hall beginning in December 2012 with completion in time for the spring semester 2013. In addition, there will be a Virtual Computing Laboratory for SB. Terminal Computing, installation of a digital AV System, and a Wireless Presentation System will be installed in Gelman Library. A Portable Personal Lecture Capture System will also be made available by AT.

Services provided by AT include maintaining walk-in support offices in Funger Hall, 2020 K Street and 1957 E Street for equipment operational assistance for faculty, along with maintenance of and equipment check-out for laptops, projectors, document and video cameras, presentation clickers, VGA adapters, and portable speaker systems. DVD/VCR

players, CD players, and cassette players are made available on a rental basis. With the prospect of growing demand over the foreseeable future for its services, Academic Technologies faces a number of critical issues which include severe constraints on its financial resources that impede the rapid deployment of up-to-date AV and IT equipment and services. There is a lack of funding for life-cycle management of equipment, insufficient budget allocation for equipment acquisition, an insufficient level of staff support, and underfunding for equipment maintenance operations. As an example of the latter, Professor Helgert said that one bulb replacement for a projector costs $500 and these have to be replaced three times per year.

Turning to the status of current University Construction Projects, Professor Helgert reported that construction of the SEH is currently on schedule and on budget. Final architectural drawings are due in December 2012, and completion of the building is still planned for the end of 2014. Groundbreaking for the Public Health Building for the School of Public Health and Health Services occurred in May 2012, with construction on a 18-month completion schedule. At present space has not been allocated, but all space will be dedicated to SPHHS. Work on the GW Museum and the required reallocation of space in adjacent Corcoran Hall has commenced, with excavation started in late October 2012. The estimated completion timeframe for this project is about a year and a half. A related project, the construction of the Conservation Building at the Virginia Campus was expected to start by late October 2012 and to be completed by mid October 2013. At present none of the space in this facility has been dedicated to specific programs.

Other construction projects include the redevelopment of several townhouse investment properties adjacent to the main campus and completion of the Law Learning Center parking garage in December 2012. There are currently no plans for above-grade construction on that site. Construction on the reconfiguration of the entrance to Gelman Library has started and will be conducted mostly during the summers of 2013 and 2014. The Churchill Document Center will be housed on the ground floor of the Library, and the Library entrance will be relocated from H Street to Kogan Plaza.

Renovation projects underway include renovation of Ross Hall on the 5th and 6th floors. Work on the central utility plant is also ongoing. Various renovation projects have been completed or are underway in Munson Hall, Lisner Hall and the Marvin Center. The Radiology facility temporarily located in the parking lot of Tompkins Hall is scheduled for relocation, with a date still to be determined. In the area of miscellaneous projects, work at the Mount Vernon Campus has centered on reconfiguring the entrance to the campus and closing one access point. At the Virginia Campus, a new signage plan has been filed with the county in order to give the campus a better identity than it presently has. Approval of the plan is expected by the end of 2012.

Professor Helgert concluded the Report by outlining University plans for future projects, including drafting a business plan for the renovation of a new Superdorm encompassing the West End, Schenley and Crawford Hall residence buildings, bounded by H and I Streets and 22nd and 21st Street. This will become an 850 bed facility for second and third year students. With an estimated cost of $13 million, the mixed-use project includes some retail space, and limited faculty housing units. The start of construction is planned for the summer of 2013, with completion by 2016. The Hall on Virginia Avenue is

being considered for use as a combination of mixed housing for faculty and graduate students. Pending the completion of studies, a proposal may be made to implement the plan as part of next year's capital budget.

In the near term future, the University continues to pursue zoning approval for the eventual redevelopment of 2100 Penn (the Kaiser Building) and the adjacent townhouses for continued use as investment properties. The current intent is that any redevelopment of 2100 Penn would be carried out in cooperation with a developer partner, similar to the Square 54 project with the commercial project providing revenue to the University.

Discussion followed. Professor Briscoe inquired if there is a plan for refurbishing Corcoran Hall. Provost Lerman responded that the Board of Trustees has approved a budget for this which will stretch over a 3 to 4 year rolling cycle. Once the SEH is occupied, this budget will cover the systematic renovation of facilities in the backfill buildings, including Corcoran Hall. Senior Vice Provost Maltzman clarified that the Board has allocated funds for the development of a plan for the backfill space. Probably the top priority is trying to figure out what to do with the Corcoran space which really is not redeployable in its current format, as it is primarily configured as chemistry labs that need to be removed. Professor Briscoe said his Committee was eager to get started on making plans for the redeveloped space, and it would be helpful to be in contact with someone familiar with the guidelines under which the Committee will be working. Senior Vice Provost Maltzman said that, as a first step, work has begun on a Request for Proposals soliciting bids from various contractors/designers for the space. Provost Lerman added that after the contract is awarded, outside architects and planners will be available to work with those who plan to be residents or are already residents of that space. Professor Briscoe also asked if Samson Hall would be demolished during this process, but this has not yet been determined.

Professor Parsons inquired about the cost of the Superdorm, saying he thought it was $130 million rather than $13 million. Provost Lerman asked Dean Konwerski to respond, and he confirmed that the tab would be more than $13 million. He also offered to supply an accurate number following the meeting.

Professor Yezer noted the staggering number of projects, and inquired about the level of faculty involvement in these facilities decisions. Professor Helgert responded that the Physical Facilities Committee is in a sense a fact-finding group which serves as the interface between the Faculty Senate, University decision-makers, and the people who carry out the projects. It can thus inform the Senate about what is going on and what the current thinking is right now. However, the Committee does not have any particular representation on groups that really influence the choice of what's going to be deployed. Professor Helgert added that he thought it very important that the Senate has such representation, but it does not currently. Planning for the SEH was an exception, in that the Physical Facilities Committee had a substantial involvement in the planning of that.

Further discussion followed, with Professor Yezer noting there are quite a number of completely unsatisfactory classrooms in use. He said he thought it might be useful to submit such a list to the PF Committee so that it could craft a resolution on this subject for

Senate approval. This would in due course reach the University Administration and the Board of Trustees and would, hopefully, spark some corrective action.

Professor Hamano asked what percentage of the 3,000 courses are taught in current classrooms suitable for smaller 20 student classes, and if that ratio would remain the same over the projected future when backfill projects are completed. These figures were not readily available, but Professor Helgert said he thought backfill space in Corcoran, Tompkins, and Phillips Halls could be used to fill some of the critical need for smaller classrooms. This is certainly a long-term project

Professor Barnhill noted that at least initially, one of the justifications for constructing the SEH was that facilities available for teaching and laboratories were poor. He expressed surprise at the idea of scaling back the teaching space aspects of the SEH in favor of other activities, and asked Professor Helgert to elaborate. Professor Helgert said he could only offer his personal thinking about this. A part of the financing for the SEH relies on Indirect Cost Recoveries from sponsored research, This in turn means a shift of focus to research-based activity rather than teaching space. Another important factor is the idea that activity in the SEH should be very interdisciplinary and that includes research. Over the last 12 months there has been a lot of discussion about how best to allocate the space between teaching labs and research labs, with the result that gradually the balance has swung toward providing more research labs.

On behalf of faculty colleagues in his School, Professor Williams asked if there are plans to provide a new building for GSEHD. Professor Helgert responded that when this issue first came up some years ago in discussions about the SEH and Tompkins Hall, the Physical Facilities Committee recommended that the Senate pass a resolution indicating that space in Tompkins Hall should house the GSEHD. That resolution was adopted. However, planning for the ultimate use of the emptied backfill space is just now getting underway.

Discussion continued, with Professor Barnhill inquiring what kind of budget is available to arrive at satisfactory teaching facilities for Science and Engineering students. Professor Helgert responded that he did not know. Provost Lerman said that as the backfill plan is rolled out monies would be provided to renovate additional teaching labs to make up for the number displaced by the emphasis on research facilities in the SHH. Professor Barnhill followed up by asking if it would be possible to bring to the Senate a business plan, including an operating budget and staffing plan, along with an estimate of revenues for sponsored research the University hopes to generate from the SHH so that it would be possible to see what type of operating surpluses or deficits it might be reasonable to expect. Provost Lerman responded that conversations have been held in the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee and the three sources of revenue for the SHH remain those revenues from Square 54, philanthropy, and research. He said he thought the information might be appropriate information to include when FP&B reports to the Senate. Professor Parsons commented that he is a member of FP&B and the Committee has not seen any sort of business plan such as the one requested by Professor Barnhill. He also noted the irony of renovating Corcoran Hall to provide teaching labs, as this has been viewed over the past 2 decades as an idea unworthy of consideration.

Professor Parsons said he was heartened by the pending rapid addition of new faculty, and asked about the plan for providing office space for these people. Professor Helgert responded that he could not provide a complete answer at this time. Obviously when the SHH goes online a number of current offices will be vacated in several buildings and decisions will have to be made on which facilities will provide office and classroom space.

Further discussion followed, with Professor Kim asking if it was really cost effective or efficient to build facilities first and then decide how these would be used later. She added that it seemed to her that the way buildings were designed and built might be different based on expected needs. Professor Barnhill renewed his call for a business plan for SEH operations, to include an operating budget on a forward-looking basis. He said he thought this would also be useful for the Senate when it begins to discuss the Patent and Licensing Policy because financing will be an item that needs to be considered in the context of an overall strategy for managing an exceedingly large investment that the University is making in technology.

GENERAL BUSINESS

I.   NOMINATIONS FOR ELECTION TO SENATE STANDING COMMITTEES

Professor Castleberry moved the nomination for election of Professor Marshall W. Alcorn to the Committee on University and Urban Affairs. The nomination was approved.

II.   REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Professor Castleberry presented the Report, which is included with these minutes. He also indicated that the Report presented at October meeting of the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees would be distributed with these minutes.

III.   INTERIM REPORTS OF SENATE COMMITTEES

The Interim Report of the Libraries Committee was distributed with the agenda for the meeting

IV.   PROVOST'S REMARKS

Provost Lerman indicated that the President had left no remarks for him to present to the Senate, and then proceeded to his own. He spoke at some length about what he described as a significant error in University reporting on the percentage of students in the freshman class who graduated in the top ten percent of their high school classes. External auditors have examined the University's other reported data and concluded that no other data is involved. *U.S. News & World Report* was informed of this error, and the President has issued a public statement on the subject As he made very clear, this is certainly not in the spirit of the ethical standards to which the University holds itself, and is in no uncertain terms something the University will do everything possible to prevent in the future. Provost Lerman indicated that he thought Dr. Knapp's letter clearly expressed the sentiments of the University community, and that he was in agreement with the commitment that every

possible step is being taken to ensure that information released to outside parties is accurate.

Specific actions taken in response to this lapse include: the Admissions Office will no longer be responsible for the reporting of such data; that will be transferred to the Institutional Research Office. In addition, the University will have its internal audit group examine the information produced by Institutional Research to ensure its accuracy. As most know, the University has already instituted a search for a new Director of Enrollment who will oversee all of the Admissions operations and Student Financial Aid. The Provost concluded by expressing his profound regret about this incident. He added he thought it is something that has caused a more than usual share of disappointment, and that when these errors occur he thought all the University can do is acknowledge they happened, deal with them forthrightly, and take appropriate corrective action. This has occupied a. significant amount of the leadership's time, and is being dealt with as an extraordinarily serious matter by the senior administration. Senior Vice Provost Maltzman led the investigation and carried out the corrective action. A Q&A has also been posted online.

Professor Parsons said he thought it quite appalling that this has gone on for a decade and a half, but added that even though he was a critic of administrations in general, everyone has to understand that this originated with a totally different University Administration, that of President Trachtenberg. He observed that GW has moved beyond this world, and that he appreciated the way in which the current Administration is attacking this problem, as it makes for very, very different leadership as viewed by the faculty.

Provost Lerman expressed appreciation for these remarks and said the Administration would continue to operate in this way and ensure that the Senate and other bodies could trust what it says. He also invited those with further questions to contact Senior Vice Provost Maltzman with their concerns.

BRIEF STATEMENTS (AND QUESTIONS)

There were no brief statements or questions.

ADJOURNMENT

Upon motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 4:11 p.m.

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

Senate Committee on Physical Facilities

Report to the Faculty Senate on the Status
of University Physical Facilities

November 9, 2012

List of Topics

- Status of University Classrooms
- Status and Plans for Audio Visual and Information Technologies
- Status of University Construction and Renovation Projects
- Plans for Future University Construction Projects

Physical Facilities Committee Members

- Catherine Anderson
- Phillippe Bardet
- Melia Beheler
- Linda Gallo
- Alan Greenberg
- Hermann Helgert, Chair
- Hugo Junghenn
- Michael King
- Diana Lipscomb
- Randall Packer

Contributing to this Report

Alicia O'Neil Knight- Senior Associate Vice President of Operations

Craig Linebaugh - Senior Associate Provost for Academic Operations

PB Garrett - Associate Provost and Chief Academic Technology Officer

Current Status of Classroom Availability

- The total number of general purpose classrooms and laboratories currently stands at 135, serving more than 3000 courses

- In addition, eight special rooms offer access to video conferencing capabilities or computing facilities

- A total of 25 general purpose classrooms accommodating between 12 and 20 students is available. Each of these classrooms serves 70 courses

- There exists a critical need for additional smaller classrooms holding up to 20 students

Plans to Improve Classroom Availability

- The University is currently in an information gathering mode to explore more efficient uses of classrooms. A key objective is to reduce or eliminate the reliance on leased classroom space on K Street and 1776 G Street.

- The problem is becoming more acute since the number of teaching labs going into the SEH has been reduced, which in turn reduces the amount of available backspace in buildings from which science and engineering facilities will be relocated

Plans to Improve Classroom Availability

- Preliminary consideration is being given to the option of part of Tompkins remaining with SEAS and the 6th and 7th floors of Phillips dedicated to Columbian College and reconfigured into general classroom space.

- A complete study of the utilization of the backfill space will begin this fall, with the objective of clarifying requirements and determining the best allocation of these resources when they become available.

Plans to Improve Classroom Availability

- New classroom scheduling software will be operational shortly
- Scheduling envisions only 15 minutes between successive uses of a classroom

Current Status of Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- Currently 84 classrooms and laboratories are equipped with mostly outdated analog AV and IT infrastructure, with an additional 51 classrooms equipped with low-technology infrastructure

- 31 Colonial Cast classrooms on the main campus are equipped with lecture capture technology, allowing the recording of audio and video content and its distribution to Blackboard and iTunesU

Current Status of Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- 3 SCALE-UP (Student-Centered Active Learning Environments for Undergraduate Programs) classrooms in Monroe B33, Monroe 111 and Tompkins 201 include modern AV and IT equipment designed to encourage and facilitate collaboration between students

- All technology enhanced classrooms include Course Response Systems. Portable systems for use in other classrooms can also be obtained on a need basis from Academic Technologies

Plans for Future Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- The University is on a three-to-four year schedule to equip all classrooms with modern 100% digital information technology

- A new strategic plan is under development, focusing on the deployment of a standardized AV and IT infrastructure across three campuses, differentiated by seating capacity and classroom use (High Tech Room, Mid Tech Room, Low Tech Room)

- As a first step all analog televisions, overhead and video projectors, other peripherals such as DVD players, and personal computers will be removed

Standardized Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- Infrastructure Components
  - Whiteboards and/or whiteboard painted walls
  - High Definition LCD Displays for 30 seats or less
  - LCD Projectors for more than 30 seats
  - Digital ceiling mounted cameras for 30 or more seats
  - Resident workstations - initially Windows-based, transitioning to simple terminals with access to "cloud" information (virtual workstations)

Standardized Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- Lecture recording capability (audio, video, VGA) for 30 or more seats
- Speech reinforcement by wireless microphones, or by podium microphones for 50 or more seats

Standardized Classroom Audio-Visual and Information Technology

- Connectivity
  - Digital AV signal routing using HDMI specifications
  - Digital interface and wireless network access for faculty laptops, tablets or smart phones
  - Wired networking capability for workstations and AV systems
  - Voice over IP connectivity between classroom and AT customer service team
  - Managed network switches for remote monitoring
  - Course response systems (Turning point)

Academic Technologies - Current Activities

- Initially four pilot classrooms in Phillips Hall will be configured, with a starting date of December 2012 and completion in time for the Spring 2013 semester
- Academic Technologies is currently testing several other model installations
  - Virtual Computing Laboratory for GWSB
  - Terminal Computing in Gelman B05 and 609
  - Digital AV System in Gelman 609
  - Wireless Presentation System in Gelman 609
  - Portable Personal Lecture Capture System

Academic Technologies - Services

- AT maintains walk-in support offices in Funger Hall, 2020 K Street and 1957 E Street for
  - Equipment operational assistance for faculty
  - Equipment check-out
    - Laptops
    - Projectors, document and video cameras
    - presentation clickers
    - VGA adapters
    - portable speaker systems
    - DVD/VCR players, CD players, cassette players

Academic Technologies - Critical Issues

- AT faces severe constraints on its financial resources that impede the rapid deployment of up-to-date AV and IT equipment and services
  - Lack of funding for life cycle management of equipment
  - Insufficient budget allocation for equipment acquisition
  - Insufficient level of staff support
  - Underfunding of equipment maintenance operations

Status of University Construction Projects

- Construction of the SEH is currently on schedule and on budget. Final architectural drawings are due in December 2012. Completion of the building is still planned for the end of 2014.

- Groundbreaking for the Public Health Building for the School of Public Health and Health Services occurred in May 2012, with construction on a 18-month completion schedule. At present space has not been allocated, but all space will be dedicated to SPHHS.

Status of University Construction Projects

- Work on the GW Museum and the required reallocation of space in Corcoran is underway, with excavation started in late October 2012.

- The construction of the Conservation Building at the Virginia Campus was expected to start by late October 2012 and to be completed by mid October 2013. At present none of the space has been dedicated to specific programs.

Status of University Construction Projects

- Several townhouse investment properties adjacent to the main campus are being redeveloped.

- The Law Learning Center parking garage is scheduled for completion in December 2012. There are currently no plans for above grade construction on that site.

- Construction on the reconfiguration of the entrance to Gelman has started and will mostly be conducted during the summers of 2013 and 2014.

Status of University Renovation Projects

- Ross Hall is undergoing renovation on the 5th and 6th floors. Work is also ongoing on the central utility plant.

- Various renovation projects have been completed or are underway in Munson Hall, Lisner Hall and the Marvin Center.

- The Radiology facility temporarily located in the parking lot of Tompkins is scheduled for relocation, with a date still to be determined.

Miscellaneous Projects

- Work at the Mount Vernon Campus has centered on reconfiguring the entrance to the campus and closing one access point.

- At the Virginia Campus a new signage plan has been filed with the county, with approval expected by the end of 2012.

University Plans for Future Projects

- A business plan for the renovation of the Superdorm encompassing The West End, The Schenley and the Crawford Hall residence buildings, bounded by H and I Streets and 22nd and 21st Street, into a 850 bed facility for 2nd and 3rd year students is currently being drafted. The start of construction is planned for the summer of 2013, with completion by 2016.

- The mixed-use project includes some retail space, and limited faculty housing units.

- The cost of the project is estimated at $13 million

University Plans for Future Projects

- The Hall on Virginia Avenue is being considered for use as a combination of mixed housing for faculty and graduate students.

- Pending completion of studies, a proposal may be made to implement the plan as part of next year's capital budget.

University Plans for Future Projects

- The University continues to pursue zoning approval for the eventual redevelopment of 2100 Penn (the Kaiser Building) and the adjacent townhouses for continued use as investment properties.

- The current intent is that any redevelopment of 2100 Penn would be carried out in cooperation with a developer partner, similar to the Square 54 project.

REPORT OF THE FACULTY SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
TO THE ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
12 October, 2012
Dr. Michael S. Castleberry, Chair

<u>May Meeting of the Faculty Senate:</u>

Resolution 12/1, submitted by the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom and titled, *A Resolution to Endorse Amendments to the George Washington University Policy on Conflicts of Interest and Commitment for Faculty and Investigators* was approved and forwarded to the Administration. The Resolution was accepted and, at the May Board meeting, the Trustees voted to adopt changes to the Policy appended to the Resolution.

Resolution 12-2, submitted by Professor Yezer, and titled *A Resolution on Information Systems Needed to Support Faculty Research Efforts*, was approved and forwarded to the Administration for review. The resolution focused on the lack of compatibility of computer systems required to document multi-year sponsored projects and the lack of availability of budget systems that enable a multi-year comparison and review of the budget process of a contract or grant. The administration is aware of faculty concerns in this area and we are continuing to discuss this matter in committee with the President and the Provost.

The 2012-13 Senate heard an update from Provost Lerman on the Strategic Plan and was briefed on the information that would be presented to the Board of Trustees at their June retreat.

Professor Cordes, Chair of the Fiscal Planning and Budgeting Committee, presented a detailed and comprehensive report on the university budget. The Senate will continue to hear updates from the Budget Committee at regular intervals during the 2012-2013 AY.

<u>September Meeting of the Faculty Senate:</u>

The administration requested an emergency action from the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate The Faculty *Organization Plan* authorizes the Executive Committee to act for the Faculty Senate in this way when it is not feasible to call a special meeting of the full Senate to consider the matter. The *Organization Plan* also requires that such emergency action be confirmed by the Faculty Senate at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

Guidance from the U.S. Department of Education mandating changes in Sexual Harassment Policies of U.S. Colleges and Universities included a date for compliance by November, 2012. At the Executive Committee meeting in late August, the Administration requested that the Committee act on the draft Sexual Harassment Policy that had been reviewed and approved by DOE so the University would be in compliance with DOE guidance at the beginning of the academic year 2012-13, rather than making changes to the Policy mid-year.

After considerable discussion and in view of possible federal repercussions for non-compliance, the Executive Committee granted emergency approval for implementation of an Interim Sexual Harassment Policy shortly after its August meeting once it received and reviewed the draft Interim Policy. At its meeting on September 14, the Senate confirmed this emergency action of the Executive Committee. The Interim Policy has been referred to the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom for its review and recommendations on a final policy.

The Senate received another update on the Strategic Plan in September by Provost Lerman, including a timeline for final review and availability of the document to the faculty in October. He indicated that it would be presented again to the Board of Trustees at its October meeting. There was also a preliminary discussion with the Provost and Senior Vice Provost Maltzman on the way in which the Senate and the Executive Committee would review the document and the manner in which committee assignments would be made to develop implementation plans. These will be finalized when the document is made available for review.

The Chair of the Executive Committee reviewed the nonconcurrence process during the 2011-2012 academic year and informed the Senate of the following:

a. The members of the Executive Committee spent considerable time over the summer on three of four nonconcurrences. While the following information is not specific to any of those cases, it reflects the views and concerns of the Executive Committee members:

1. It is known by all that the University is in a period of change as it moves toward the goal of becoming a pre-eminent teaching and research institution. This path poses certain adjustments for the present and one of those adjustments will be the way in which new faculty will be evaluated during a period of change. To review this process......

b. New faculty members in tenure lines come to the University with a strong record of research and scholarship. In their first four years in rank they are required to demonstrate further their capabilities in accordance with department and school tenure and promotion criteria. They compile a dossier of their teaching, research, and scholarship and, at the beginning of the fifth year of service, are reviewed by the department, the APT committee of the school, the Dean, and the Provost.

c. A nonconcurrence with departmental recommendations for promotion and tenure by an administrative officer of the University results in a review by the Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate. The intent of that review is to seek resolution of the case. If none is found, the matter is returned to the department of origin and the department may elect to appeal to the President or the Board of Trustees for a final decision.

In connection with the review process during 2011-2012 the following observations were made:

a. The period of adjustment in expectations for faculty performance will continue to be a topic of concern during the early years of elevating standards for performance in accordance with the stated aspirations of the members of the University

community. The Executive Committee has reviewed the tenure/promotion process, e.g. annual reviews in most schools by departments and APT committees, and dossier preparation and presentation at the beginning of the fifth year.

b. The guidelines for tenure and promotion for a candidate are those of the department and school governance documents at the time of hire. The candidate has four years to develop his or her professional plan with review from mentors and APT committees.

c. The Executive Committee has concerns that department faculty guidelines and APT guidance may be at odds with decanal and administrative views of "excellence" as required by the *Faculty Code*. Absent discussion at the department level, the school level, and with the school administration, as well as with the leadership of the University, there exists the possibility that conflicting, variant, confusing, or erroneous information could be provided to a candidate in process.

d. To avoid such problems the members of the Executive Committee believe it would be advisable for departments, APT Committees, and Deans to engage in discussions about to the specifics of their expectations of candidates given the stated guidelines that exist in governance documents.

Without some semblance of agreement during a period where standards are being raised there exists the possibility that a candidate will be expected to have done something that he or she did not know was a demand or standard that had to be met. While a candidate for tenure and promotion is totally responsible for what they do and what they choose to include in their dossier, there does need to be discussion and general agreement within departments and between departments, schools, APT committees, and deans, and the administration during this period of qualitative change.

Accordingly, the Executive Committee will be requesting that the Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies Committee and the Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom consider these issues during the 2012-2013 Senate session. The Executive Committee has begun and will continue discussions with the President and Provost. Similar information will be presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Trustees. The goal of these discussions will be to bring greater clarity to the tenure and promotion process during this period of change while, at the same time, recognizing the reality of the guidance documents and procedures candidates were given to follow at the time of their original appointment.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
Faculty Senate Executive Committee

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
9 November 2012

The Executive Committee has reviewed the University Strategic Plan draft and is requesting that Senate Committees meet and review the document and submit comments and recommendations for changes. In addition, the Executive Committee is sending to Standing Committee Chairs specific issues that individual committee might decide to address. We will schedule time at the December meeting to include commentary from members of the Senate and from Senate Committees. We look forward to further discussions on the plan as we enter the new year.

Philip Wirtz resigned from the Faculty Senate last week to undertake a new role as a Vice Dean in the School of Business. He has been a significant presence in this chamber and he will be missed. He has served in a wide range of capacities and has logged many terms on the Executive Committee. His sense of humor has served the chamber as much as his desire to get to the essence of a problem—and then solve it. We wish him well in his new endeavors but we shall miss him in his corner seat.

Members of the Faculty Senate may have been surprised to read in the *Hatchet* that the Executive Committee had 'approved' the Smoke-Free Campus initiative. So was the Executive Committee. As members of this chamber are aware, with the exception of rare occurrences such as the Interim Sexual Harassment Policy, which the Committee did approve under the *Faculty Code* provision to act for the Senate during the interregnum but subject to immediate Senate confirmation at its next meeting, the Executive Committee does not 'act'. We are advisory, we meet and discuss with the administration the agenda for the Senate Meeting and other related issues. At the last meeting Vice President for Human Resources Ellis presented on the Smoke-Free Campus initiative. The Committee heard her presentation and has invited her to report to the Senate at the December meeting. In addition we requested that she present to the Joint Committee on Faculty and Students which she also agreed to do. I mention this because, subsequent to the first *Hatchet* article about the supposed "approval," there was an editorial opposing a ban on smoking that has not yet been discussed or vetted in this chamber or anywhere else on campus. We believe this to be in error as well as prejudicial to free and open discussion of this or any other matter that could come before this body. We will discuss in Committee how to ensure that information comes to the Senate and the campus community is free of any interpretation or bias before there has been an opportunity for senatorial review and discussion and will report to you further at a later date.

Despite the attempts by my handlers to ensure that I'm accurate on most matters, I managed to err in my last report to you on grievances and nonconcurrences. I reported that there was both a grievance as well as a nonconcurrence from CCAS. That was a mistake. There was a grievance but in my enthusiasm to report I somehow managed to add a second case that does not exist. My handler did catch the error immediately and the minutes are correct. I am chastised and pledge further diligence in my report.

Therefore, I report that there is a continuing grievance from CCAS as well as the nonconcurrence that has continued from the 2011-12 AY. The grievance from SPHHS has been resolved.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is, because of the holiday schedule, next Friday, November 16. Please submit any resolutions or topics for consideration at the December meeting to Sue Campell before that time   The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is on December 14. As mentioned, we have invited Vice President Ellis to present on the Smoke-Free Campus initiative and Dean Michael Feuer from GSEHD to make a report on the School and the progress on the 75-25 issue.

On behalf of the members of the Executive Committee, we wish you all a very happy Thanksgiving Holiday!

REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
Michael S. Castleberry, Chair
9 November 2012

The Executive Committee has reviewed the University Strategic Plan draft and is requesting that Senate Committees meet and review the document and submit comments and recommendations for changes. In addition, the Executive Committee is sending to Standing Committee Chairs specific issues that individual committee might decide to address. We will schedule time at the December meeting to include commentary from members of the Senate and from Senate Committees. We look forward to further discussions on the plan as we enter the new year.

Philip Wirtz resigned from the Faculty Senate last week to undertake a new role as a Vice Dean in the School of Business. He has been a significant presence in this chamber and he will be missed. He has served in a wide range of capacities and has logged many terms on the Executive Committee. His sense of humor has served the chamber as much as his desire to get to the essence of a problem—and then solve it. We wish him well in his new endeavors but we shall miss him in his corner seat.

Members of the Faculty Senate may have been surprised to read in the *Hatchet* that the Executive Committee had 'approved' the Smoke-Free Campus initiative. So was the Executive Committee. As members of this chamber are aware, with the exception of rare occurrences such as the Interim Sexual Harassment Policy, which the Committee did approve under the *Faculty Code* provision to act for the Senate during the interregnum but subject to immediate Senate confirmation at its next meeting, the Executive Committee does not 'act'. We are advisory, we meet and discuss with the administration the agenda for the Senate Meeting and other related issues. At the last meeting Vice President for Human Resources Ellis presented on the Smoke-Free Campus initiative. The Committee heard her presentation and has invited her to report to the Senate at the December meeting. In addition we requested that she present to the Joint Committee on Faculty and Students which she also agreed to do. I mention this because, subsequent to the first *Hatchet* article about the supposed "approval," there was an editorial opposing a ban on smoking that has not yet been discussed or vetted in this chamber or anywhere else on campus. We believe this to be in error as well as prejudicial to free and open discussion of this or any other matter that could come before this body. We will discuss in Committee how to ensure that information comes to the Senate and the campus community is free of any interpretation or bias before there has been an opportunity for senatorial review and discussion and will report to you further at a later date.

Despite the attempts by my handlers to ensure that I'm accurate on most matters, I managed to err in my last report to you on grievances and nonconcurrences. I reported that there was both a grievance as well as a nonconcurrence from CCAS. That was a mistake. There was a grievance but in my enthusiasm to report I somehow managed to add a second case that does not exist. My handler did catch the error immediately and the minutes are correct. I am chastised and pledge further diligence in my report.

Therefore, I report that there is a continuing grievance from CCAS as well as the nonconcurrence that has continued from the 2011-12 AY. The grievance from SPHHS has been resolved.

The next meeting of the Executive Committee is, because of the holiday schedule, next Friday, November 16. Please submit any resolutions or topics for consideration at the December meeting to Sue Campell before that time   The next meeting of the Faculty Senate is on December 14. As mentioned, we have invited Vice President Ellis to present on the Smoke-Free Campus initiative and Dean Michael Feuer from GSEHD to make a report on the School and the progress on the 75-25 issue.

On behalf of the members of the Executive Committee, we wish you all a very happy Thanksgiving Holiday!

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D.C.

The Faculty Senate

November 1, 2012

The Faculty Senate will meet on Friday, November 9, 2012 at 2:10 p.m. in the State Room, 1957 E Street N.W., 7th Floor

AGENDA

1.   Call to order

2.   Approval of the minutes of the meeting held on October 12, 2012 (minutes to be distributed)

3.   A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO DEAN SEARCHES (12/4); Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom, Charles Garris, Chair (Resolution 12/4 and accompanying exhibits attached)

4.   Introduction of Resolutions

5.   Report on the Reading Leaders Pilot Program: Kathryn Newcomer, Chair, University and Urban Affairs Committee

6.   Report of the Physical Facilities Committee: Hermann Helgert, Chair,

7.   General Business

   (a)   Nominations for election to Senate Standing Committees: <u>University and Urban Affairs</u>: Professor Marshall W. Alcorn

   (a)   Report of the Executive Committee: Michael S. Castleberry, Chair

   (c)   Interim Reports of Senate Committees: Libraries (the report is attached)

   (d)   Provost's Remarks

   (e)   Chair's Remarks

8.   Brief Statements (and Questions)

9.   Adjournment

Elizabeth A. Amundson
Elizabeth A. Amundson
Secretary

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE *PROCEDURES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FACULTY CODE* WITH RESPECT TO DEAN SEARCHES (12/4)

WHEREAS, Article IX.A. of the *Faculty Code* provides: "The regular, active-status faculty shares with officers of administration the responsibility for effective operation of the departments and schools and the University as a whole. In the exercise of this responsibility, the regular, active-status faculty plays a role in decisions on . . . the appointment of . . . deans";

WHEREAS, Part C.2.b) of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* ("*Code Procedures*") provides that the University may appoint the dean of a School only after a search committee consisting of tenured faculty members of that School ("Faculty Dean Search Committee"), who have been elected by the regular, active-status faculty of that School, has "considered nominations, and reported its recommendations . . . to the faculty that elected it or to the appropriate academic administrative officer" as provided in the School's bylaws; and

WHEREAS, Resolution 90/9 adopted by the Faculty Senate on December 14, 1990 (copy attached as Exhibit A), approved guidelines that (i) permit representatives of students and alumni to provide recommendations to the Faculty Dean Search Committee and to participate in interviews of decanal candidates, and (ii) permit the Vice President for Academic Affairs to "name an academic administrator . . . to participate as an advisor" to the Faculty Dean Search Committee; and

WHEREAS, in recent years representatives of students and alumni, academic administrators and members of the Board of Trustees have been appointed to serve as nonvoting members of Dean Search Committees in several Schools; and

WHEREAS, the participation of nonvoting members on Dean Search Committees is not expressly authorized by the *Code Procedures*; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the *Code Procedures* should be amended to authorize the inclusion of nonvoting members on Dean Search Committees and to establish appropriate guidelines for their participation; and

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate believes that the *Code Procedures* should also be amended to permit students, staff, untenured faculty members and alumni (with the approval of the Dean Search Committee, after consultation with the Vice President for Academic Affairs) to meet with candidates who have been selected for final interviews and provide their recommendations

to the Faculty Dean Search Committee in accordance with Resolution
90/9;

WHEREAS, the Faculty Senate endorses the "Recommended Model Principles and
Procedures for Dean Searches," which have been recommended by the
Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
and are attached to this Resolution as Exhibit B; **NOW, THEREFORE,**

**BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE
WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY**

(1) That Part C.2. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* be
amended by adding a new paragraph c), which shall read as follows:

"c) The committee of tenured faculty members elected pursuant to the first
sentence of paragraph b) above shall be designated as the "Faculty Dean Search
Committee," and those elected tenured faculty members shall be the voting
members of the committee organized to conduct a dean search (the "Dean Search
Committee"). The Dean Search Committee may also include (with the
concurrence of the Faculty Dean Search Committee) the following nonvoting
members: appropriate representatives of interested constituencies, including
students and alumni, as well as an academic administrator appointed by the Vice
President for Academic Affairs and a University Trustee appointed by the Board
of Trustees. After receiving recommendations from the nonvoting members of
the Dean Search Committee, the Faculty Dean Search Committee shall hold
executive sessions to vote on (i) criteria for selecting a new dean, (ii) the selection
of candidates for preliminary and final interviews, and/or (iii) the selection of
nominees to be presented to the faculty or to the appropriate academic
administrative officer in accordance with the first sentence of paragraph b). In
addition, the Dean Search Committee (after consultation with the Vice President
for Academic Affairs) may invite students, staff, untenured faculty members and
alumni to meet with candidates chosen for final interviews and provide their
recommendations to the Dean Search Committee.

(2) That Part C.2. of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* be
amended by designating existing paragraph c) as paragraph d).

Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom
October 5, 2012

A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE GUIDELINES FOR SEARCHES FOR
DEANS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY (90/9)

WHEREAS, The Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative
Matters as They Affect the Faculty has reviewed the process for
searches for Deans and has developed general guidelines; NOW,
THEREFORE

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON
UNIVERSITY:

That the attached Guidelines are endorsed for use by Dean
Search Committees.

Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty
November 11, 1990

Adopted December 14, 1990

SEARCHES FOR DEANS OF THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

Preamble

In an effort to improve the search process for Deans and to promote
cooperation and coordination within the University community in
this matter, the Faculty Senate Committee on Administrative Matters
as They Affect the Faculty recommends the adoption of the following
guidelines. These guidelines serve to expand on the procedures
stipulated in the Faculty Code.

Background

Based on discussions with various parties involved in recent dean
searches, several issues have surfaced which support the adoption of
Guidelines for Dean searches. The following 'list highlights the key
points:

Deans playa critical role in relation to university
administration, faculty, students, and alumni. Therefore
the dean search process should encompass participation of
these four groups.

Dean searches are not conducted frequently in any given
school or college. As a result these units are, unable to
develop procedures to facilitate eff-cient operation of the
process.

It is important for faculty search committees to understand
what is expected of Deans in our University.

Expeditious processing and review of applications is critical
to assure that potentially qualified candidates are not lost
from the applicant pool because of earlier job offers from
other institutions.

Use of an executive search firm can be useful in developing a
large pool of qualified applicants.

Given the large number of persons involved in the dean
search process, confidentiality of information about
candidates for these positions is critical.

Recommendation

The Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the
Faculty hereby recommends the adoption of the following
Guidelines:

GUIDELINES FOR SEARCHES FOR DEANS OF
THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

All schools and colleges are requested to develop a mechanism for the selection of a committee of students which will play a formal supporting role to the elected faculty search committee. This student committee would have the opportunity to participate in interviews of candidates, reporting their recommendations to the faculty search committee. The identity and mandate of the student committee would be made known to all students in the unit.

All schools and colleges are requested to develop a mechanism for the selection of a committee of alumni which will play a formal supporting role to the elected faculty search committee. This alumni committee would have the opportunity to participate in interviews of candidates, reporting their recommendations to the faculty search committee. The identity and mandate of this alumni committee would be made known to the alumni in the unit.

At the time that faculty search committees are elected by any school or college following the bylaws of that unit, the Vice President for Academic Affairs may name an academic administrator from outside that school or college to participate as an advisor to the committee with regard to the definition of selection criteria, screening of resumes, interviewing of candidates, and other functions of the committee.

Support services for Dean searches will be provided by the office of the Assistant to the Board of Trustees. This office will provide staff assistance for scheduling campus visits for interviews and other administrative services required by the search process. This office will also facilitate the utilization of an executive search firm, should the faculty committee choose to contract for such services.

The Chair of the Dean Search Committee should report at least monthly to the respective faculty and to the Vice President for Academic Affairs on the status of the search.

Each faculty search committee should develop procedures to assure confidentiality of information about candidates for dean positions.

Approved by the Senate Committee on Administrative Matters as They Affect the Faculty, November 11, 1990

EXHIBIT B to "A Resolution to Amend the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* with Respect to Dean Searches"

RECOMMENDED MODEL

PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES

FOR DEAN SEARCHES

The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

April 9, 2012

PREAMBLE:

Article IX.A. of the George Washington University *Faculty Code* and Part C.2.b) of the *Procedures for the Implementation of the Faculty Code* affirm the central role of the Faculty in the dean search process. However, the Faculty Senate recognized in Resolution 90/9, adopted on December 14, 1990, that students and alumni should have an opportunity to advise the Faculty during the dean search process. In addition, the participation of representatives of the University Administration, the School Advisory Council, the Board of Trustees (BOT) and other important stakeholders is desirable in order to ensure the success of the search. The Faculty Senate Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom supports an inclusive dean search process that allows all major stakeholders to contribute substantially to the process. To achieve this goal, the Committee recommends the following model dean search principles and procedures, which are based on principles and procedures adopted by the School of Engineering and Applied Science in February 2008:

I. DEFINITIONS:

FACULTY COMMITTEE (FC): A special or standing committee elected by the regular, active status faculty of THE SCHOOL from among THE SCHOOL faculty's tenured members [Faculty Code, Procedures for Implementation of the Faculty Code, Art. C.2.b)]

REPRESENTATIVES (REPS): One representative from each of the following groups will be solicited:
a. Undergraduate Students
b. Graduate Students
c. GW Administration
d. Board of Trustees
e. SCHOOL Advisory Council
f. Alumni

The student representatives will be sought from the STUDENT ORGANIZATION, the Administration representative will be appointed by the EVP for Academic Affairs, the Trustee Representative will be sought from the Chair of the Board of Trustees, the SCHOOL Advisory Council Rep will be sought from the Chair of the SCHOOL Advisory Council, and the Alumni Rep will be sought from the President of the SCHOOL Alumni Association. An individual may serve as the representative for more than one group.

SEARCH FIRM (SF): A firm hired by GW to assist the Search Committee in various administrative tasks.

DEAN SEARCH COMMITTEE (DSC): A committee consisting of three components: The FC, the REPS, and the SF. As the Faculty Code[2] imposes a special responsibility on the FC [Faculty Code Section IX.A., and Faculty Code Procedures, Part C.2.b)], the FC will be the only component to vote.

CHAIR: A Faculty member elected from among the FC who serves as the representative of the DSC. The Chair is responsible for the coordination and administration of the search. The Chair will prepare reports to the Faculty and the Administration, schedule meetings, coordinate and assign subcommittees, coordinate inputs from representatives and from the search firm, and serve as a liaison with candidates.

II. CHARGE OF COMMITTEE

The DSC is charged to establish criteria for the selection of the dean, consider nominations, and report its recommendations in accordance with the SCHOOL bylaws to the SCHOOL faculty and the President of the University. [Faculty Code. Procedures, Art. C.2.b)]

III.   STANDING RULES

    a. Meetings will be conducted according to Robert's Rules of Order.

    b. Votes will be taken by secret ballot upon the request of any member of the FC.

    c. In the event that members of the FC cannot attend a meeting, their votes by proxy are permitted, and should be conveyed directly to the Chair of the DSC prior to the meeting.

    d. Executive sessions may be called by the Chair in which only FC members will participate.

    e. The highest level of confidentiality commensurate with careful scrutiny of candidates shall be maintained. In the early phases of the search, it is expected that the level of confidentiality will be higher than in the later stages.

    f. The Chair will report the progress of the search to the PROVOST monthly or as necessary, and to the Faculty at every scheduled SCHOOL Faculty meeting.

    g. The Chair may call information-gathering meetings with the DSC and appropriate university faculty and administrators in order to be better informed in marketing THE SCHOOL to potential candidates.

IV.   CRITERIA [See Faculty Code. Procedures, Art. C.2.b]

    a. An initial draft of the dean search criteria will be created by a subcommittee formed by the Chair, and the draft will be distributed to DSC members. A meeting of the DSC will be called to discuss the criteria.

    b. The FC will consolidate the results of the discussion and will adopt proposed criteria for approval by the regular, active-status SCHOOL faculty.

    c. The resulting Criteria will be presented to the regular, active-status SCHOOL faculty as a resolution at the earliest scheduled meeting, for debate and approval. Once approved, the resulting criteria will serve for the remainder of the search.

V.   PROCESS OF SEARCH

    a. The committee will conduct a national search for a dean for the school. With the assistance of SF, it will prepare advertisements to be placed in national professional periodicals and national newspapers requesting nominations and applications for the position of dean.

    b. Funding for the Search will be provided by Academic Affairs.

STAGE 1

a. Applications and nominations shall be sent to the Office of Academic Affairs, which will place all applications and nominations on Blackboard. Access to Blackboard will be provided to all DSC members. The names of the applicants will be held strictly confidential.

b. The SF will contact by telephone every person nominated and solicit an application, and shall gather and provide to the DSC background information about each applicant. This information shall be placed in Blackboard under the candidate's file.

c. The SF will assist the DSC to establish a dean search Web site that will feature information about the search, the position, SCHOOL, and the University.

d. All members of the DSC will be asked to review all applications. However, in order to ensure that each application receives a thorough and timely review, the Chair shall assign the applications to DSC members for review such that each application will be reviewed by at least three FC members. These reviewers shall present their findings and assessments to the DSC.

The Chair will call periodic meetings of the DSC to discuss the individual applications. Every member of the DSC shall rate each applicant on a scale from 1 to 3, based on the Criteria, where 1 is highly recommended, 2 is recommended, and 3 is not recommended.

e. After completing the previous step (Step d), the Chair will convene a meeting of the FC to rank the Stage 1 applicants, with the goal of selecting approximately 12-16 candidates for STAGE 2 interviews. The FC's ranking of applicants and selection of candidates for Stage 2 interviews will be based on the ratings and the comments of the DSC members, and on the applications themselves.

STAGE 2

a. The full DSC shall participate in Stage 2 interviews as provided below. Confidentiality of the names of candidates will be emphasized.

b. The SF will be asked to obtain at least five telephone references for each of the candidates. The SF will be requested to take careful notes on their finding. These results will be posted on Blackboard.

c. The SF may be asked to make certain inquiries about the candidates as deemed appropriate.

d. The SF will prepare a brief prospectus on THE SCHOOL to be given to the candidate. The Chair will consult with the DSC to determine which information is to

4

be provided.

e. The initial interviews will be held at a convenient location where the candidate is unlikely to encounter SCHOOL colleagues. These meetings might occur in Rice Hall, Virginia Campus, or in rented space near an airport.

f. Private meetings with each candidate by each group shall be conducted as follows:

    a. DSC (1.0 hr)
    b. FC (0.5 hr)
    c. Administrative REP (0.5 hr)
    d. Private meetings with other REPS as requested.

g. The Chair will convene the DSC to discuss the results of the STAGE 2 interviews.

h. The Chair will convene a meeting of the FC to rank the Stage 2 candidates and select candidates for Stage 3 consideration, based on the input and discussions of all the DSC members in the previous step (Step g). The goal of the FC will be to select approximately five candidates for STAGE 3 interviews and presentations on campus.

STAGE 3

a. A detailed Prospectus on THE SCHOOL shall be prepared by the SF in collaboration with the DSC which will be provided to each STAGE 3 candidate.

b. Each STAGE 3 candidate shall be invited to campus. The following activities may be scheduled:

    1.   A public seminar, by the dean candidate, on his/her education philosophy, research accomplishments, administrative philosophy, leadership, and vision for THE SCHOOL.
    2.   Private meeting with DSC
    3.   Lunch with Department Chairs
    4.   Meeting with THE SCHOOL Associate Deans and THE SCHOOL Administrative staff
    5.   Private meetings with faculty of each department.
    6.   Private meeting with President and PROVOST.
    7.   Private meeting with students.
    8.   Private meeting with trustees.
    9.   Private meeting with NAC members.
    10.   Private meeting with Alumni.
    11.   Visit to VA Campus & meeting with AVP for VA Campus.
    12.   Dinner with DSC.

c. After each visit, each group will be polled and written evaluations solicited according to the SCHOOL criteria. The Chair will compile these evaluations.

d. At the conclusion of the STAGE 3 interviews, the DSC will convene to discuss the findings. The FC will then move into executive session and rank the candidates for the purpose of selecting nominees to be recommended to [the Faculty OR the Administration] in accordance with Part C.2.b) of the Faculty Code Procedures and SCHOOL bylaws.

e. Depending on the ranking, the DSC, in accordance with Faculty Code Procedures, Part C.2.b) and SCHOOL bylaws, will make its recommendation of nominees to [the Faculty OR the Administration]. The DSC will provide a detailed explanation of the reasoning behind its recommendation. The DSC will endeavor to provide [the Faculty OR the Administration] with a recommendation of at least three unranked nominees. However, in the event, for example, that one nominee is not deemed to be comparable to the other two, only two nominees' names may be forwarded for the consideration of [the Faculty OR the Administration].

f. In the event that [the Faculty OR the Administration] does not find the recommendations acceptable, or the Administration is unable to negotiate favorably with the nominees submitted, the DSC will reevaluate lower-ranked STAGE 3 candidates and (subject to the prior approval of the FC in executive session) may provide additional recommendations. If the DSC considers the remaining candidates in the pool to be unacceptable, the DSC will decide on appropriate further action.